

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 were pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of October 18, 2007, claims 1-6 and 8-20 were rejected. Claim 7 was cancelled in a previous amendment and remains cancelled.

With this amendment, claim 1 is amended and claim 3 is cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-20 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,243,142) (“*Ishikawa*”) in view of *Yamazaki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,834,327) (“*Yamazaki*”). Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites:

“conductive patterns provided on each surface of said glass substrate wherein a conductive pattern on the sealed surface of said glass substrate is in electrical communication with a conductive pattern on the exposed side surface via said through-holes, the conductive patterns on said sealed side surface being connected to at least one display element.”

...and

“a sealing member provided to fill said through-holes, said sealing member being a conductive paste containing an epoxy resin as a binder operable to inhibit moisture permeation through said through-holes.”

This is clearly, unlike *Ishikawa* which fails to disclose providing conductive patterns on each surface of the glass substrate which are in electrical communication with each other via

through-holes filled with a conductive paste. Instead, *Ishikawa* discloses a substrate covered by a electroconductive plating layer 4 without any disclose of conductive patterns or filling holes in the substrate between two surfaces with a non-electroconductive paste 5 . See U.S. Patent No. 5,243,142 Col. 2, l. 28-55. Further, nowhere does *Ishikawa* disclose providing conductive patterns on each surface of the glass substrate which are in electrical communication with each other via through-holes filled with a conductive paste.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing conductive patterns on each surface of the glass substrate which are in electrical communication with each other via through-holes filled with a conductive paste, the circuits can be electrically connected to each other with a low resistance and without the use of a planar special region . See Specification Para [0004]; Para. [0008]. Accordingly, the printed wiring board disclosed in *Ishikawa* is incapable of producing the claimed printed wiring board.

Yamazaki, similarly, fails to disclose anything relating to providing conductive patterns on each surface of the glass substrate which are in electrical communication with each other via through-holes filled with a conductive paste.

Therefore, because *Ishikawa* or *Yamazaki* or any combination of the two fail to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of the claim 1, the rejection is improper. Because claims 2-6 and 8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, they are patentable at least for the same reasons.

Claims 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yamazaki* in view of *Stevens* (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,356) (*Stevens*) (in further view of *Nakazawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,349). Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

This rejection relies on *Stevens* with an earliest effective filing date of May 14, 2001. However, the instant application claims priority to the Japanese Patent Application No. P11-271950, filed on September 27, 1999. Applicant submitted a certified English language translation of the Japanese priority application on June 9, 2003, perfecting their claim of priority. *Stevens* should never have been cited against the claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that *Stevens* does not qualify as a prior art reference, and respectfully request the withdrawal of these rejections.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

12237823/V-1